

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *

9 BOBBY LEE MONTGOMERY,

Case No. 2:11-cv-02079-MMD-PAL

10 v. Plaintiff,

11 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
12 ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
DEPARTMENT, et al., RECOMMENDATION

13 Defendants.

14
15 Before this Court is the Report and Recommendation of the United States
16 Magistrate Judge (dkt. no. 33), entered by the Honorable Peggy A. Leen regarding
17 Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (dkt. nos. 18, 20, 25). Plaintiff Bobby Lee Montgomery
18 filed an objection to Magistrate Judge Leen's Report and Recommendation in
19 accordance with Local Rule LR IB 3-2 of the Rules of Practice of the United States
20 District Court for the District of Nevada. (Dkt. no. 34). The Objection appeared to reargue
21 the merits of the Motions, and did not specify particular objections to the Report and
22 Recommendation.

23 Nevertheless, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record in this case
24 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B)-(C) and Local Rule IB 3-2 and determines
25 that the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Leen should be accepted and
26 adopted in whole.

27 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation
28 (dkt. no. 33) is ADOPTED.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the District Attorney Defendants' Motion to
2 Dismiss (dkt. no. 25) is GRANTED.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Goodman's Motion to Dismiss (dkt.
4 no. 18) is GRANTED.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
6 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (dkt. no. 20) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.
7 Only the individual capacity claims of unlawful detention and arrest against Defendants
8 Kartchner, Coates, and Ruiz survive.

9 In sum, the following claims are hereby dismissed:

- 10 1. Plaintiff's official capacity claims against the Arresting Officers;
- 11 2. Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Goodman and Gillespie;
- 12 3. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant City Council;
- 13 4. Plaintiff's malicious prosecution claim;
- 14 5. Plaintiff's excessive use of force claim;
- 15 6. Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment due process claim against the District
16 Attorney Defendants;
- 17 7. Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claim;
- 18 8. Plaintiff's First Amendment claim;
- 19 9. Plaintiff's Ninth Amendment claim;
- 20 10. Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim; and
- 21 11. Plaintiff's intentional infliction of emotional distress claim.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 ENTERED THIS 20th day of June 2013.

24
25 
26 MIRANDA M. DU
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28